

Appl. No. 10/612,858
Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871
In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 10112371

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on March 21, 2005 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Present Status of Application

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 15 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al (U.S. Patent 6,816,212). Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent 6,618,240, hereinafter Kim I). Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent 6,411,352, hereinafter Kim II). Claims 17-24 are withdrawn from consideration.

In this paper, claims 1, 4-8, 11-13, 16, 17, 20-24, and 26 are amended. Claims 2-3, 9-10, and 18-19 are canceled. New claims 27-32 are added. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found in the original claims, pages 3-6 of the specification, and in Figs. 2A-4. The summary is amended to correspond to the amended claims. Thus, after entry of these amendments, claims 1, 4-8, 11-17, and 20-32 are pending, wherein claims 17 and 20-24 are withdrawn from consideration.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Amended claim 1 of the present application recites an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an LCD module to an electronic device comprising an arm having a hook extending from a side thereof, the arm connected to the electronic device; and a frame disposed on a side of the LCD module, having a first opening and a second opening both on a lateral surface thereof; wherein the arm and the frame are connected by inserting the hook through the first opening with the tail of the hook located at the second opening.

Appl. No. 10/612,858
Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871
In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 10112371

Amended claim 26 recites an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an a LCD module to an electronic device comprising a fixing member, comprising a hook extending from a side thereof; and a frame disposed on a side of the LCD module, comprising a first opening and a second opening both on a lateral surface thereof; wherein the fixing member and the frame are connected by inserting the hook through the first opening with the tail of the hook located at the second opening.

Lin et al

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 15 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Lin et al do not teach or suggest an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an a LCD module to an electronic device comprising a frame disposed on a side of the LCD module, the frame comprising a first opening and a second opening both on a lateral surface thereof, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

With reference to Figs. 3 and 4 of Lin et al, hole 311 and groove 321 are situated in different surfaces of metal frame 3. As a result, Applicant notes that it may be difficult to pass the transverse protrusion 422 through the hole 311 in Lin et al. Moreover, the electric module 4 and

Appl. No. 10/612,858

Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 10112371

metal frame 3 may be difficult to assemble or separate because the hole 311 and the groove 321 are situated in different surfaces.

Applicant submits that Lin et al fails to teach or suggest a frame having first and second openings both on a lateral surface thereof, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application. For at least this reason, it is Applicant's belief that claims 1 and 26 are allowable over Lin et al. Insofar as claims 4-8, 11-16, 25 and 33 depend from claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also allowable over the cited reference.

Kim I

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim I. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Kim I does not teach or suggest an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an LCD module to an electronic device comprising a frame having a first opening and a second opening both on a lateral surface thereof, and a hook extending from a side of an arm or fixing member, wherein the arm and the frame are connected by inserting the hook through the first opening with the tail of the hook located at the second opening, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application.

With reference to column 6, lines 31-35 of Kim I, the side wall portion 11 of the display module 10 has a plurality of holes 12 and 13, and the hinge frame 60 has a plurality of protrusions 61 and 62 corresponding to the holes 12 and 13, respectively, to mount the hinge frame 60 to the display module 10.

As shown in Fig. 8, protrusions 61 and 62 are completely different structures independently extending from frame 60, and therefore cannot be taken together as "*a hook extending from a side*" of an arm or fixing member. In addition, neither protrusion can fairly be construed as the "tail" of the other protrusion.

Appl. No. 10/612,858

Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 10112371

Furthermore, taken separately, neither protrusion 61 or 62 Kim is **a hook, extending from a side of an arm or fixing member, inserted through a first opening with the tail of the hook located at a second opening**, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application. Instead, protrusions 61 or 62 separately extend from a hinge frame and are separately inserted into two different openings.

Even if one were to take the combined structure of protrusions 61 and 62 as "a hook," the combined structure of protrusions 61 and 62 is not **inserted through a first opening with the tail of the hook located at a second opening**, as recited in the claims. Instead, one "tail end" 61 of the combined structure is inserted in a first opening while the other "tail end" 62 is separately inserted into a second opening.

Furthermore, since the independent holes 12 and 13 in Kim I do not communicate, Kim I cannot be considered to teach or suggest the limitation that the hook is inserted **through** the first opening with the tail of the hook located at the second opening, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application.

Applicant further notes that Kim I does not teach or suggest that the LCD module connecting mechanism further comprises a mold body disposed in the LCD module, wherein the mold body has a channel communicating the first and second openings, as recited in amended claim 8.

For at least these reasons, it is Applicant's belief that claims 1 and 26 are allowable over Kim I. Insofar as claims 4-8, 11-16, 25 and 33 depend from claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also allowable over the cited reference. Applicant further submits that claims 11-16 patentably distinguish over the Kim I by virtue of their dependency from claim 8.

Kim II

Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim II. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Appl. No. 10/612,858

Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 10112371

Kim II does not teach or suggest an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an LCD module to an electronic device comprising a frame having a first opening and a second opening both on a lateral surface thereof, and a hook extending from a side of an arm or fixing member, wherein the arm and the frame are connected by inserting the hook through the first opening with the tail of the hook located at the second opening, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application.

With reference to column 3, lines 33-35 of Kim II, the board holder 24 is engaged with the frame 20 and fixed on the PCB 22 preferably by means of a screw (not shown), thereby mounting the PCB 22 on the rear face of the frame 20. That is, Kim II teaches that the board holder 24 and the PCB 22 are fixed by a screw.

In addition, as described in column 3, lines 59-66 of Kim II, the first hook 24C is formed at the rear half of the securing wings 24B, and the second hook or flange 24D is formed on the base plate 24A. Applicant notes that the first hook 24C and the second hook 24D in Kim II are completely different structures independently extending from the base plate 24A, and therefore cannot be taken together as **"a hook extending from a side"** of an arm or fixing member. In addition, neither hook can fairly be construed as the "tail" of the other hook.

Furthermore, taken separately, neither first hook 24C nor second hook 24D of Kim II is **a hook, extending from a side of an arm or fixing member, inserted through a first opening with the tail of the hook located at a second opening**, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the present application. Instead, hook 24C and hook 24D separately extend from a base plate and are separately inserted into two different openings.

Even if one were to take the combined structure of hooks 24C and 24D as "a hook", the combined structure of hooks 24C and 24D is not **inserted through a first opening with the tail of the hook located at a second opening**, as recited in the claims. Instead, one "tail end" 24C of the combined structure is inserted in a first opening while the other "tail end" 24D is separately inserted into a second opening.

Appl. No. 10/612,858

Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 10112371

Applicant further notes that Kim II does not teach or suggest that the LCD module connecting mechanism further comprises a mold body disposed in the LCD module, wherein the mold body has a channel communicating the first and second openings, as recited in amended claim 8.

For at least this reason, it is Applicant's belief that claims 1 and 26 are allowable over Kim II. Insofar as claims 4-8, 11-16, 25 and 33 depend from claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also allowable over the cited reference. Applicant further submits that claims 11-16 patentably distinguish over the Kim II by virtue of their dependency from claim 8.

New Claims 27-32

New claim 27 recites an LCD module connecting mechanism for connecting an a LCD module to an electronic device, comprising: a fixing member connected to the electronic device, the fixing member comprising a hook extending from a surface of the fixing member, the hook comprising a first portion and a tail portion transverse to the first portion; and a frame connected to the LCD module, the frame comprising a first opening and a second opening, both on a lateral surface thereof; wherein the first portion and tail portion of the hook are inserted through the first opening, and the tail portion is received by the second opening.

Applicant submits that none of the prior art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests an LCD module connecting mechanism with the features described in claim 27. It is therefore Applicant's belief that claim 27 is allowable over the cited references. Insofar as claims 28-32 depend from claim 27, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also allowable.

Withdrawn Claims 17, 20-24

Claims 26 and 27 are believed to be generic to the species identified in the election of species requirement mailed on December 10, 2004. As noted by the Examiner in the election of species requirement mailed on December 10, 2004, upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of the generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed above, allowable over the cited references. Applicant further submits that claim 17 includes all the limitations of claims 26 and 27. Applicant

Appl. No. 10/612,858

Examiner: DUONG, THOI V, Art Unit 2871

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 10112371

therefore requests that claims 17, and 20-24 depending there from, be considered by the Examiner upon the allowance of claims 26 and 27.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero

Reg. No. 52,143

Customer No. 34,283

Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P111064NAQ